

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

<hr/>	GREENVILLE VENTURES LLC,:	CIVIL ACTION
	<i>Plaintiff,</i>	:
	:	:
	v.	:
	:	:
	JAMES JANNUZIO, <i>et al.</i> ,	:
	<i>Defendant.</i>	NO. 22-3214
<hr/>	:	:
	JAMES JANNUZIO, <i>et al.</i> ,	:
	<i>Third Party Plaintiffs,</i>	:
	:	:
	v.	:
	:	:
	GREENVILLE VENTURES LLC,:	:
	<i>Nominal Counter</i>	:
	<i>Defendant,</i>	:
	:	:
	and	:
	:	:
	PETER C. DANBY, <i>et al.</i> ,	:
	<i>Third Party Defendants.</i>	:
<hr/>		

ORDER

AND NOW, this 7th day of December 2022, the Court hereby gives NOTICE to the parties of its intent to appoint a Special Master under Rule 53 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to resolve remaining discovery disputes and other pretrial motions filed or to be filed by the parties as designated by the Court.¹

¹ Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 53(b)(1) requires a court, before appointing a master, to “give the parties notice and an opportunity to be heard.” “The purpose of a special master is to aid judges in the performance of specific judicial duties, as they may arise in the progress of a

The Court proposes to appoint as Special Master Joseph Crawford, Esquire.² The parties are **ORDERED** to file, on or before, December 16, 2022 any objections they have to the appointment of a Special Master or to the specific appointment of Mr. Crawford.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Chad F. Kenney

CHAD F. KENNEY, JUDGE

cause.” *Glover v. Wells Fargo Home Mortg.*, 629 F. App’x 331, 338 (3d Cir. 2015) (internal quotations and citation omitted). To this end, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 53(a)(1)(c) authorizes appointment of a master to “address pretrial and posttrial matters that cannot be effectively and timely addressed by an available district judge or magistrate judge of the district.”

Here, the parties are unable to resolve their discovery disputes without Court intervention. Recently, Defendants, Counterclaimants, and Third-Party Plaintiffs’ moved to Compel Plaintiff Greenville Ventures, LLC and Third Party Defendant GV Holdco, LLC to provide adequate responses to requests for production. ECF No. 36. The Court is aware that the same parties here are currently litigating another federal case and that the other case has involved substantial discovery disputes as well. *Iron Gate Hardware, Inc. v. John Doe, et al.*, 22-cv-1132 (E.D. Pa.). The Court cannot effectively and timely address the instant discovery disagreement or those that the Court anticipates will arise during the pendency of the case. Accordingly, a Special Master is necessary to resolve the pending and any future discovery or pretrial disputes among the parties.

² Mr. Crawford has over forty years of experience in civil litigation and arbitration and has served as a Partner at esteemed law firms. See <https://crawfordadvocacy.com/#aboutcrawford>.